

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the consideration given the present application.

Claims 24-48 are now pending in this application. Claims 24 and 36 are independent.

Claims 1-23 have been canceled. Claims 24-48 have been added.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

**Rejection under 35 USC 102**

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Karr et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-23 have been canceled in favor of added claims 24-48. Therefore, comments regarding the rejection will be addressed relative to pending claims 24-48.

Applicants have reviewed the rather voluminous disclosure of Karr et al. Applicants have been unable to find any disclosure of the stability aspect of the present invention. Specifically, independent claim 24 recites a combination of method steps including:

adding a value  $k$  to the strongest signal not in the first subset, which may or may not change the ranking of the signals received at various strengths in the order of strength;

considering the  $m$  strongest signals to be a second subset;

when a majority of the  $m$  strongest signals of the second subset are associated with a same zone, determining whether that same zone matches the candidate zone, and if so, determining the portable device to be located in the candidate zone.

Independent claim 36 recites a combination of structural features including a processor:

adding a value  $k$  to the strongest signal not in the first subset, which may or may not change the ranking of the signals received at various strengths in the order of strength;

considering the  $m$  strongest signals to be a second subset;

when a majority of the  $m$  strongest signals of the second subset are associated with a same zone, determining whether that same zone matches the candidate zone, and if so, determining the portable device to be located in the candidate zone

Applicants respectfully assert that at least the above mentioned limitations are not shown or suggested by Karr et al. If the Examiner persists in a rejection applying the Karr et al. reference, the Examiner is asked to make reference to the page, column and line numbers which show or suggest the stability aspect of the present invention, as recited in the above quotes from independent claims 24 and 36.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 21, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott L. Lowe

Registration No.: 41,458  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant